

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are cancelled and new claims are added for examination.

I. THE OBJECTION TO THE DRAWING/SPECIFICATION

In paragraphs 2-8 of the Office Action, the drawing is objected to for numerous reasons. The points noted by the Examiner in paragraph have been carefully reviewed and appropriate modifications have been made to the Figures and/or specification so the drawing and specification read consistent with one another.

In particular, in view of the points raised by the Examiner, the detector 29 in Figures 2 and 10 was renumbered as 808 consistent with Figure 9; the bead mapper 20 in Figure 7 was renumbered throughout as 201 (Compare "20" in Figure 1.); the labels "134" and "136" are removed from Figures 8-9; the CCD 60 in Figure 10 was renumber "61" in the Figure and throughout the specification (The solution is called out as "60" in Figure 6.); Reference label "203" was added to Figure 10; Figure 23 was amended to reference "631"; Figure 33a was amended to add "560" in place of --565--; Figure 38 was amended to eliminate the middle ray lines; Figure 39 was amended to add "302"; Figure 40 was amended to eliminate the four ray lines 686;

Figure 47 was amended to add labels "712" and "714". The numerous remaining issues were all addressed by amending the specification.

Replacement sheets are attached showing changes in red ink marking. Request for acceptance of the same is respectfully submitted. Upon receiving such acceptance, and upon an issuance of a Notice of Allowance, a formal drawing will be submitted with these changes.

The two recitations of the '754 patent on page 23 of the patent application was also clarified.

A new abstract is also provided.

II. THE OBJECTION TO THE CLAIM 11

In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, claim 11 is objected to.

Claim 11 is cancelled.

III. THE DOUBLE PATENTING OBJECTION

In paragraphs 10-12 of the Office Action, the originally filed claims were rejected based on an obviousness type double patenting rejection.

All these claims are rejected and a new set of claims submitted herein, which are patentably distinct from the

claims in patent application serial nos. 10/661,031 (CV 39A) and 10/661,234 (CV 43).

IV. THE ANTICIPATION/OBVIOUSNESS REJECTIONS

In paragraphs 13-21 of the Office Action, the originally filed claims were rejected as being anticipated and/or obvious based on two cited references alone or in combination with one or more other references.

The originally filed claims were all cancelled and a new set of claims submitted herein, which are deemed patentably distinct from the cited references.

V. CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and an early allowance of all the claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William J. Barber
Attorney for the Applicants
Registration No. 32,720

/lml

March 24, 2005
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Customer No. 004955
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 261-1234